

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

**CHRISTINA M. HOWSON,** :  
**Plaintiff** : **CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:14-2071**  
**v.** : **(JUDGE MANNION)**  
**CAROLYN W. COLVIN,** :  
**Defendant** :

**MEMORANDUM**

Pending before the court is the report of Magistrate Judge Martin C. Carlson, which recommends that the instant action be remanded to the Commissioner for further consideration. (Doc. [19](#)). The defendant has waived her opportunity to object to Judge Carlson's report and recommendation, (Doc. 20), and, with the deadline to do so having passed, the plaintiff has not filed any objections.

Where no objection is made to a report and recommendation, the court should, as a matter of good practice, "satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation."

[Fed.R.Civ.P. 72\(b\)](#), advisory committee notes; see also [Univac Dental Co. v. Dentsply Intern., Inc.](#), 702 F.Supp.2d 465, 469 (2010) (citing [Henderson v. Carlson](#), 812 F.2d 874, 878 (3d Cir. 1987) (explaining judges should give

some review to every Report and Recommendation)). Nevertheless, whether timely objections are made or not, the district court may accept, not accept or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge. [28 U.S.C. §636\(b\)\(1\)](#); Local Rule 72.31.

The court has reviewed the reasons presented by Judge Carlson for remanding the instant action to the Commissioner for further consideration. Because the court agrees with the sound reasoning that led Judge Carlson to the conclusions in his report and finds no clear error on the face of the record, the court will adopt the report in its entirety. An appropriate order shall issue.

s/ Malachy E. Mannion  
**MALACHY E. MANNION**  
**United States District Judge**

**Date: March 29, 2016**

O:\Mannion\shared\MEMORANDA - DJ\CIVIL MEMORANDA\2014 MEMORANDA\14-2071-01.wpd